

I have already pointed out the many and important differences which there are between the two forms. A comparison of MacGillivray's figure with my own will show that they are more or less dissimilar in almost every element of the structure. It is not the mere *number* of the spines which is different; the difference in character is much more important. MacGillivray's description, "long, slender, incurved spines," does not apply to those of *B. distans*. Their form and arrangement, as shown in his figure, offer a complete contrast to those of the present species*.

It is unnecessary that I should repeat here the careful comparison of the two forms which is embodied in the original account of *B. distans*; but I may emphasize the differences in the avicularia, of which enlarged figures are given.

'Annals,' Feb. 1882 (p. 80 sep.).

Membranipora pilosa, Linn., form *multispinata*.

This form was referred doubtfully to *M. pilosa*, but I now regard it as a distinct species which will rank as *M. multispinata* (see the original description, *loc. cit.* and the figure on plate v.).

[To be continued.]

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES.

Catalogue of the Type Fossils in the Woodwardian Museum, Cambridge. By HENRY WOODS, B.A., F.G.S. With a Preface by T. McKENNY HUGHES, M.A., F.R.S. 8vo. 189 pp. Cambridge, 1891.

To enable biologists to be within their rights, and not to infringe on those of others, in giving original names to new genera of animals and plants, there have been provided published lists (and very lengthy catalogues they are) of the appellations already appropriated; and lists of specific names are available to a limited extent; but still the recorder of a new species has to be *assured* whether or no his specimens differ from or agree with already published forms; and to this end it is requisite that he should see those that have been already described, the published figures and descriptions not being always satisfactory.

* 'Polyzoa of Victoria,' decade v. p. 32. pl. xlvi. figs. 3.

These particular specimens or *published types* (by no means often real biological types of species or genera) have unfortunately in many cases been mislaid, or even lost; but to ensure that in future palæontological workers should be able to find and examine them, it has been proposed that catalogues should be made of such "types" existing in public and private museums. The Bristol Museum has already supplied such a list, and the Catalogue before us is one of such a desirable series. It contains notes on 1666 specimens that have been either described or alluded to (with or without figures) in books and memoirs, with references to authors, works, localities, and formations; also to donors and collectors; adding synonyms and occasional notes.

Of these published "types," then, in the Woodwardian Museum palæontologists may find:—fossils of doubtful alliance, 17; plants, 37; sponges, 22; graptolites, 29; corals, 126; echinoderms (in seven divisions), 122; worms, 13; polyzoans, 43; brachiopods, 143; lamellibranchs, 291; gasteropods, 267; other molluses, 141; trilobites, 136; decapods, 34; phyllocarids, 24; other crustaceans, 15; fishes, 75; reptiles, 74; other vertebrates, 17.

This book is well and clearly printed. There are but few verbal errors to be noted besides those in the "Corrigenda,"—such as *Anomozamites minus* [*minor*], from the careless copying of a former specific name: so also *Acidaspis erinaceus* instead of *erinacea*, and p. 45, *Trachyderma lævis* [*ve*]; p. 115, *Trochonema bijugosa* [*sum*]; p. 126, *Crioceras occultus* [*tum*]; p. 169, *Doratorhynchus validum* [*dus*]; *Bowmani*, at p. 146, and *Philippi*, at p. 169, are misspelt, and the diphthongs are dropped in *Mæandrina* and *Thamnastræa*. At p. 154 "*Glyphova*" should be *Glyphea*, and *sublævis* should be *sublævis*. These are flaws in a book of nomenclature. The degradation of the rightful capitals in specific terms derived from proper names, and the capricious reduction of *ü* in genitives to a single *i*, are nomenclatural faults due to the mistaken notions of the neo-classicists. We should have liked that their puristic notions had been better directed, and that they had printed *Lindstrœmia* and *Gæpperti* with real diphthongs instead of with the modified vowel of the Germans; so also *Münsteri* should be *Muensteri*.

Delagoa Bay: its Natives and Natural History. By ROSE MONTEIRO.
With Illustrations. G. Philip and Son, 1891.

THIS brightly-written little book is from a lady whose name is well known at Kew Gardens for the dried plants and seeds she has sent home, and also to many entomologists as a collector of insects; the frontispiece showing nine new species of African butterflies which she discovered during her second visit to Delagoa Bay. The author was no novice in African life, for she had already been in Angola with her husband, the late J. J. Monteiro, an Englishman